



YOUTH  
AUTHORITY

# *Quarterly*

Looking Back  
On The Law  
And YA 00001

Volume Thirty-Two  
SUMMER

Number Two  
NINETEEN SEVENTY-NINE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Edmund G. Brown Jr.  
*Governor*

HEALTH AND WELFARE AGENCY

Mario Obledo  
*Secretary*



DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

4241 Williamsburgh Dr.,  
Sacramento  
Phone: 445-4673

Pearl S. West  
*Director and Board Chairman*

Charles A. Kuhl  
*Chief Deputy Director*

BOARD MEMBERS

Rudy Ahumada  
Antonio Amador  
Ida Casillas  
David L. Chambers

Leon S. Kaplan  
James J. Ware Jr.  
*Vice Chairman*  
Richard Woolstrum

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Arthur L. German, *Chairman*

James Embree  
Stephen Golden  
Keith Griffiths

Robert Kenney  
William Scully  
Fred Torrisi

## **CONTENTS—SUMMER 1979**

From Herrera to Darryl T. ....	Harold Richard	2
Whatever Happened to YA I? ....	James J. Ware Jr.	9
Steps On the Path to Reality ....	Ray Smith	15
Chinatown Youth Gangs—Past, Present, and Future....	Joseph Morici and Dennis Flanders	19
Education In the Youth Authority.....	Fred Torrisi, Editor	25
DeWitt Nelson Training Center—		
Inculcating the Work Ethic .....	Fred Torrisi	29

## FROM HERRERA TO DARRYL T.\*

BY HAROLD RICHARD

*Mr. Richard is a Board Representative on the  
California Youth Authority Board*

Between 1943 and 1978, the philosophies and practices of the California Youth Authority have been strongly influenced by a series of important court decisions. These have established constitutional safeguards for due process and raise the possibility that future decisions may clarify the issue of punishment versus rehabilitation.

"Over 100 years ago the Supreme Court of Virginia observed that a state prisoner was 'a slave of the state' and that he could have no redress in the courts of law since he possessed no rights."<sup>1</sup>

From this and other sources grew the so-called "hands-off" doctrine of the courts' relations to correctional systems at all levels of government: "The penal and correctional institutions are under the control and responsibility of the executive branch of the government and courts will not interfere with the conduct, management and disciplinary control of this type of institution except in extreme cases."<sup>2</sup>

As a result, judicial intervention in correctional systems was almost totally absent for nearly 200 years. In the late years of the 1960's and extending to the present, this policy has experienced drastic change. Police agencies were the first to experience the results of the new interest with the *Miranda* ruling, from which many other rulings followed. The courts and their practices were next in line followed rapidly by correctional institutions, probation and parole.

Some of the rulings that have so dramatically changed practices in agencies such as the California Youth Authority stemmed from abuses in the adult systems, but the rulings also had application to practice within juvenile and youthful offender systems. Others were engendered from juvenile and youthful offender systems and were clearly directed at correcting abuses peculiar to society's dealings with its delinquent youth.

Change began to occur and then accelerate in the early 1960's with the recognition, for the first time, by the U.S. Supreme Court that portions of the Civil Rights Act of 1871 provided redress to a state prisoner whose constitutional rights had been violated by someone acting under color of state law.

In effect, the court decisions that followed reflected a belief on the part of the judiciary that the former "hands off" policy was not viable in the face of an overall correctional system that increasing numbers of people felt to be a colossal failure. The conclusion was reached that judicial intervention was required to protect the most fundamental rights of the system's clientele.

Until the early 1960's, very few people questioned the methods and philosophy

\*This paper was originally prepared as part of a task force assignment. Much of the material used comes from training materials prepared by the McGeorge School of Law for training of Youth Authority Board personnel.

<sup>1</sup>Corrections and the Courts: *A Plea for Understanding and Implementation*: Judge Donald P. Lay Resolution: Fall 1974 P.5.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid

of the juvenile court and its supporting system of institutions and probation and parole services. Although the first juvenile court was established in this country in 1899, it was not until the *Kent*<sup>3</sup> decision that the Supreme Court began to question the wisdom and the fairness of a system that seemingly promised so much and delivered so little. Most of the objections raised in the past 15 years have been concerned less with what the juvenile court and its attendant systems were intended to be and more with what it had become. These critics have argued the point of view that at the same time that the juvenile court established a benevolent, protective, non-adversarial relationship between the youth and the state, it also effected a loss of procedural rights upon youth. This loss was obscured and forgotten for over a half century in the promise of a system that purported to serve the youth's best interest. Worse still, the institutions and systems established to carry out the dispositions of the court were found in some cases to be incapable of providing the benign and rehabilitative care promised and, at their worst, were barbaric in the level of care afforded the youths who were committed to them. The sacrifice of substantive rights for the sake of procedural informality in the case of youth and the almost total lack of due process safeguards for prisoners, probationers and parolees called for intervention—and it came. In both cases, the forces at work represent the new interest of the judiciary in the total field of corrections; be it adult, juvenile or youthful offender. Court decisions dealing with adult offenders have had application for youth; decisions stemming from the abuses within the juvenile system have led to other substantive changes. In either case, the direction taken has repudiated the former assumption that prisoners are simply "slaves of the state."

#### *Effect on CYA*

In varying degrees, the Youth Authority has been reshaped or reinforced by all of the court decisions briefly discussed in the following text. Some have had minor impact on procedures while others have had severe financial impact by reason of the need for new positions to implement; still others have preempted areas of decision-making formerly reserved to the department.

A review of court decisions affecting the California Youth Authority is illuminating in showing the dramatic change and accelerating pace that characterize the past 35 years. In 1943 the California Supreme Court declared the California Youth Correction Authority Act constitutional in *In re Herrera*<sup>4</sup> as to the duties and responsibilities set forth in the Act. Constitutionality again became an issue in 1944, at which time the California Supreme Court in *People v. Ralph*<sup>5</sup> again sustained constitutionality as it related to the various provisions contested.

In 1949, the first of several tests of the goal of rehabilitation was upheld by the California Supreme Court in *People v. Scherbing*.<sup>6</sup> The purpose of the Youth Authority was stated to be rehabilitation, and the court further directed that all provisions of the Act should be liberally construed in view of such purpose. Later, in 1952, the same court held in *In re Magnuson*<sup>7</sup> that the Youth Authority

<sup>3</sup> *Kent v. U.S.*, 383 U.S. 541 (1966).

<sup>4</sup> *In re Herrera*, 23 Cal. 2d. 206.

<sup>5</sup> *People v. Ralph*, 24 Cal. 2d. 575.

<sup>6</sup> *People v. Scherbing*, 93 Cal. APP. 2d. 736.

<sup>7</sup> *In re Magnuson*, 110 Cal. APP. 2d. 73.

was created for the express purpose of protecting society by more effectively substituting for retributive punishment, methods of training and treatment directed towards the correction and rehabilitation of young persons found guilty of public offenses. Building further on the establishment of this determination, in 1963 in *People v. Zaccaria*<sup>8</sup> the California Supreme Court reaffirmed the purpose of the Youth Authority Act to be protection of society through the rehabilitation of the young offender. Finally, in 1969, the California Supreme Court in *People v. Mack*<sup>9</sup> ruled that the purpose of commitment to the Youth Authority is not for punishment but rehabilitation.

In 1949 the right of the Youth Authority to transfer wards to the California Department of Corrections was contested. In *People v. Richard Scherbing*<sup>10</sup> the California Supreme Court held that the transfer of wards under its control to state prisons was not an unconstitutional delegation of judicial power. In years yet to come, through policy decisions made primarily by the Department itself and as a result of laws enacted by the Legislature, severe constraints were placed on the transfer of wards to Department of Corrections institutions, and the number dropped from a high of approximately 1,200 to the present negligible number.

In the main, court decisions stemming from the first years of the Department's existence were concerned with affirmations of the constitutionality of the Act, interpretations of the intent of the Act being to treat and rehabilitate rather than punish and, finally, decisions giving the Department wide latitude to manage wards pretty much as it saw fit, including transferring them to other departments such as the Department of Corrections.

### *Change in 1970*

Commencing in 1970, the Youth Authority and the entire field of corrections faced a major departure from the court's previous posture of "hands off". The stage was set in 1970 by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Goldberg v. Kelley*<sup>11</sup> (a matter that related to welfare recipients rather than to corrections). This case was significant because it marked a departure from the longstanding right-versus-privilege theory and established a new approach to be used when determining whether an individual faced with deprivation of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness should be provided due process protections. *Goldberg* extended to welfare recipients, prior to having their aid reduced or terminated, the right to timely and adequate notice giving reasons for termination; an effective opportunity to confront adverse witnesses to present arguments; the right to counsel; and impartial decision maker; the right to receive written notice of the evidence relied upon and reasons for the decision reached.

*Goldberg* set the stage for the 1972 landmark decision, *Morrissey v. Brewer*.<sup>12</sup> The U.S. Supreme Court made this the leading case concerning the rights of parolees in the parole revocation process. Though the rights involved in this case concerned the individual's "liberty" and not his "property", the court nevertheless applied the same balancing procedure that was utilized in *Goldberg v. Kelley* in order to determine what due process protections should apply:

<sup>8</sup> *People v. Zaccaria*, 216 Cal. APP. 2d, 787

<sup>9</sup> *People v. Mack*, 2 Cal. APP. 3d, 724

<sup>10</sup> *Scherbing*, op. cit.

<sup>11</sup> *Goldberg v. Kelley*, 397 U.S. Supreme Court

<sup>12</sup> *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 401

weighing the interests of the individual and the interests of the state in order to determine what procedural safeguards are to apply.

In the *Morrissey* decision, it was held that a hearing must be conducted reasonably soon after a parolee's arrest with the following due process requirements: (1) written notice of the claimed violations of parole; (2) disclosure to the parolee of the evidence against him; (3) opportunity to be heard in person and to present witnesses and documentary evidence; (4) the right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses; (5) a neutral and detached hearing body; (6) a written statement by the factfinders as to the evidence relied upon and the reason for revoking parole. Unlike the welfare recipient in *Goldberg*, the parolee was not given the right to counsel.

Parole practices and policies were turned upside down in *Morrissey*. Before these new procedures could be implemented, some of these rulings were applied to correctional institutions by reason of *Prewitt*,<sup>13</sup> California Supreme Court. *Prewitt* applied the rationale and procedure of *Morrissey* to the parole rescission process. Thus, once a ward is referred to parole but not yet released, his parole can be rescinded only if offered all of the *Morrissey* safeguards in a *Morrissey*-type hearing.

The following year, 1973, an issue not dealt with in *Morrissey* came before the U.S. Supreme Court. In *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*<sup>14</sup> the court considered the parolee's right to be represented by state-appointed counsel in a probation or parole revocation hearing. They concluded that in order to insure fundamental fairness in the hearing, the parolee should have counsel under certain conditions. The right was conditional upon two circumstances: (1) where there is a timely and colorable claim by the parolee that he had not committed the alleged violation, and (2) that there are substantial reasons that justify or mitigate the violation and that the reasons are complex or otherwise difficult to present.

#### *In re LaCroix*

Finally, in the procession of spinoffs from *Morrissey*, in 1974 the California Supreme Court held in *In re LaCroix*<sup>15</sup> that without a prerevocation hearing as mandated by *Morrissey*, there was no determination of probable cause and the requirements of *Morrissey* were not met. The immediate, practical impact on the Youth Authority was the creation of three differing hearings not formerly held, with attendant staff required to carry them out. The new workload called for new skills as well as new staff. The duties and responsibilities of the Youth Authority Board, in particular, were vastly expanded.

Other decisions followed, building in the main on the earlier rulings. In *In re Sturm*<sup>16</sup> the California Supreme Court found due process required the Youth Authority to support denials of parole with a written definitive statement of its reasons for denial and to communicate such statement to the ward or inmate concerned. This was deemed necessary to ensure the applicant's right to be free of arbitrary or careless decisions.

That same year in *In re Olson*,<sup>17</sup> the California Court of Appeal addressed the issue of disclosure and ruled that a policy of non-disclosure increases the

<sup>13</sup> *In re Prewitt*, Calif. Supreme Court (1972)

<sup>14</sup> *Gagnon v. Scarpelli* (1973) 411 U.S. 788

<sup>15</sup> *In re La Croix*

<sup>16</sup> *In re Sturm*, California Supreme Court (1974)

<sup>17</sup> *In re Olson*, California Court of Appeals (1974)

potential for unfairness. The inmate was thus given the right to inspect the contents of his file. This right to disclosure was not absolute, however.

Turning back to court decision that primarily affected correctional institutions, *In re Gault*<sup>18</sup> held that the due process clause of the 14th Amendment required the application of the essentials of due process and fair treatment during the adjudicative process. That decision has been expansively interpreted by numerous state and lower federal courts, however, as also establishing a firm basis to expound upon the protective rights to which youthful offenders are entitled once they have been incarcerated in state detention facilities. The *Gault* case had under review an adjudication of delinquency and commitment to an institution. The court held that the child and his parents are entitled to notice of the specific charges made and a reasonable opportunity to refute them; to be advised of the right to be represented by counsel (by appointed counsel if unable to employ one); to have the charges substantiated by witnesses appearing in court and subject to cross-examination; and to be advised that the child need not give evidence against himself.

The decision in *Gault* is clearly based on the requirements of the due process clause as applied to juvenile court proceedings. Of greatest significance, however, is the court's opinion that when a state government, as *parens patriae*, commits a youth to a detention facility, "it can meet the constitution's requirement of due process and prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment if (and only if) it furnishes adequate treatment to the trainee." The right-to-treatment concept has been addressed and expanded upon in numerous other federal district courts. The most far-reaching one thus far is *Morales v. Turman*<sup>19</sup> where the right to treatment has been reaffirmed and further developed. While this finding has since been reversed, the impact it had is not reversible.

### ***Impact of Rulings***

The impact of these rulings on the operation of state institutions has been enormous, and while the Youth Authority has not had the sanctions imposed on closure of facilities, orders to meet minimum rehabilitative standards or cutting off of intake, it has served to focus on the duty of the Department to engage in a massive restructuring of present operations to be compliant with the Constitution and the preamble to the Youth Authority Act. Budget constraints have so far prevented complete compliance.

Earlier we noted that in 1943 *In re Herrera*<sup>20</sup> found the Youth Authority Act to be constitutional. Not surprising for the time and place, *Herrera* also ruled that a Youth Authority commitment may be detained in the custody of the Authority for a period longer than the maximum sentence prescribed for the offense. In 1976, however, in the *People v. Olivas*<sup>21</sup> decision, the California Supreme Court held that the practice of committing 16 to 21-year-old misdemeanants to the Youth Authority from the criminal courts for a term potentially longer than the maximum jail term which might have been imposed for the same offense had it been perpetrated by an adult, denied the defendant

<sup>18</sup> *In re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967)

<sup>19</sup> *Morales v. Turman*, 364 F Supp 166 (ED Texas, 1973)

<sup>20</sup> *In re Herrera*, op. cit.

<sup>21</sup> *People v. Olivas*, 17 Cal. 3d. 236 Calif. Supreme Court (1976)

<sup>22</sup> *People v. Olivas*, 17 Cal. 3d. 236 Calif. Supreme Court (1976)

equal protection of the law. This decision had a fundamental impact on the Youth Authority and involved a vast screening process to identify the portion of the population affected by the ruling, the release of such persons and the development of new procedures to identify the maximum period of time wards could be held. This concept was extended to youthful felons in *People v. Sandoval*.<sup>22</sup>

Thus, the courts now had guidelines for post-courtroom proceedings, but none as yet existed for proceedings in a prison or institution that might be taken against a prisoner or a ward. The next task for the higher courts was to determine whether the differences between an individual's interest in keeping relative degrees of liberty while in an institution and the government body's need to maintain control of the institution warranted changing the *Morrissey*-mandated guidelines for intramural disciplinary proceedings.

In *Wolff v. McDonnell*,<sup>23</sup> the U.S. Supreme Court concluded that the ultimate goal of due process was the protection of the individual from the arbitrariness of government. The constitutional interests of the inmates were to be balanced against the needs of the institution in examining the flexible procedures for the prison disciplinary proceedings. The court concluded that certain due process protections should be afforded inmates. Though the loss of "liberty" involved in this case was somewhat different than that involved in a parole revocation or rescission proceeding, the court, nevertheless, applied the same balancing procedure used in *Morrissey* to determine what due process requires: (1) written notice of the claimed violation no less than 24 hours before his appearance; (2) disclosure of the evidence against him; (3) the opportunity to be heard in person and present documentary evidence; (4) a "neutral and detached" hearing body; (5) a written statement of the evidence relied upon. The court declined to allow two basic due process rights enunciated in *Morrissey*. Specifically, the inmate did not generally have to be afforded the opportunity to confront and cross-examine witnesses, and he did not have to be provided with counsel.

The Youth Authority and its policies and practice were well ahead of the *Wolff* decision and had begun to develop its own Disciplinary Decision Making System well in advance. The operation of this system had some financial impact and has led to even greater impact on the allotment of staff time to the ever-increasing different functions.

In 1978, the California Court of Appeal in *In re Darryl T.*<sup>24</sup> (hearing denied by the California Supreme Court) ruled that if the purpose of commitment to CYA is that of punishment, even in part, it violates the Juvenile Court Act.

### Trends

It appears to many informed observers that the higher courts have moved on from due process issues in the general field of corrections and the justice system. They believe that the constitutional safeguards have now been established and rulings yet to be made will be refinements on the already existing landmark decisions. Moreover, these same observers feel that in the next five to ten years, there may well be a whittling away at some of the present procedural

<sup>22</sup> *People v. Sandoval* (1977) 70 CA 3d 73, 138 Cal Rptr 609

<sup>23</sup> *Wolff v. McDonnell* (1974) 418 U.S. 539

<sup>24</sup> *In re Darryl T.* (1978) 81 CA 3d 874

requirements. In the Youth Authority, for example, compliance in some areas has exceeded requirements, and in the coming years, processes related to hearings (and particularly present policy concerning the Disciplinary Decision Making System) may be scrutinized most carefully toward the end of simplified proceedings that still meet the requirements of the various rulings noted in this paper.

Issues less general and more related to the Youth Authority are forecast to be still in foment and subject to clarification through court rulings. *Gault*<sup>25</sup> set the stage for the equal protection issue, but it is far from settled at this time. Examples of the issues in this area are the matter of credit for time served and the application of determinate sentence procedures to the Youth Authority. Will special license be given to the Youth Authority to provide less than equal protection? On what grounds? These rulings will probably center around the issue of the compelling interest of the state as raised in *Olivas*.<sup>26</sup>

On the federal level, there is a distinctly more conservative flavor to decisions coming from the courts. This is less true (or so it appears) in the highest court on the state level in California. This is undoubtedly reflective of a generally less sympathetic climate for juvenile and youthful offenders. As we grapple with the present issue of punishment versus treatment, or even the recognition of punishment, as having a place in our expressed philosophy and practice, we can anticipate guidance or rulings from higher courts. Current trends seem to suggest that room will be found for punishment to be a realistic part of the total department but that more room will still be accorded to treatment as the principal philosophy for an agency dealing with juvenile and youthful offenders.

---

<sup>25</sup> *Gault*, op. cit.

<sup>26</sup> *Olivas*, op. cit.

## WHATEVER HAPPENED TO YA 1?

BY JAMES J. WARE JR.

*Mr. Ware is Vice Chairman of the Youth Authority Board*

In the history of every nation, every organization, there is a beginning. In the case of the California Youth Authority, which has been responsible for 125,000 young offenders since its inception 38 years ago, there was a No. 1, a young man who was the first to be committed to the Department. With an eye toward the Department's history, the author has researched the young man's past and speculates on his present and future.

Somewhere in this world there is a YA 1 and I hope he is alive and well. If he is, he would now be about 51 years of age and could be living anywhere, doing just about anything. We don't know. We do know his name—it's a very common one—and we suspect that he may be content to have melted inconspicuously into the general population. If, somehow, YA 1 manages to read this article, I just want him to know that he is a very special person as far as the California Youth Authority is concerned and, even though I have never met him, I wish him well.

Since I can't tell you who YA 1 is, let me explain what he was. When a young offender is committed to the California Youth Authority he is given a YA number, five digits which identify him to this Department as thoroughly as social security numbers identify every U.S. citizen. Since the Department was established in 1941, the entire sequence of numbers from 00001 to 99999 has been used up and a second sequence of YA numbers has been started. We have now passed YA No. 25000 on the second go-around, and this means that 125,000 wards have been through the Department's system.

The YA 1 to whom I dedicate this particular narrative is the first young man committed to the Department after the passage of the Youth Authority Act in 1941. I had become intrigued with the historical significance of the first commitment some time after my own appointment to the Board in January, 1977. As a relative newcomer to the Board, I quickly took on the responsibility of sitting in on cases to determine program assignments, parole dates, parole revocations and other decision-making duties. Within months, I had talked to hundreds of young offenders and began feeling a deepening commitment to these young men and women, most of whom had been found guilty of frequently serious law violations at an early stage in their lives. For most of them, their stories were similar—broken homes, deprived backgrounds, failure in school, misfits in the community. I wondered whether it has always been that way and whether in years past there may have been other characteristics common to Youth Authority wards. From this line of thinking I began to wonder about YA 1—the first person to be committed to the Youth Authority. What was he like and what was he doing today?

My search for YA 1 received strong impetus one afternoon recently while I was visiting at the home of Tod Hodgson and his wife, Violet. Tod, who retired a little over a year ago, is a real Youth Authority veteran, having spent more than three decades with the Department, much of it as a Board Representative, one of a group of civil service employees who work closely with the Board in making

case decisions. Vi, likewise is a 30-year veteran of the Department.

Tod and Vi had a clear recollection of the young man who once was known as YA I and Tod had, in fact, tried to find him so that he could attend his retirement party. The effort proved fruitless and Tod came away with the feeling that YA I simply did not want to be found. Either he's dead, Tod decided, or he just doesn't want to step forward.

It was Tod who first filled me in on some of the historical background of the Youth Authority. During my first days with the Department, when I was first being briefed on the duties of a Board Member, Tod told me of the adoption of the Youth Authority Act, based on a model established by the American law Institute. When the Act was passed in California in 1941, it created an independent agency of state government to provide a treatment program for young offenders. The Act set aside retributive punishment as the basic method for controlling behavior and substituted a program of training and treatment that would lead to the rehabilitation of youthful offenders. The protection of society was mandated.

#### *First CYA Board*

When the California Youth Authority was thus created, the Governor appointed a Board composed of three members—Harold Slane, O. H. Close and Karl Holton, all now deceased. Shortly thereafter, the Governor commuted the sentence of a 14-year-old boy who was being held at San Quentin prison and he was reassigned to the Youth Authority. He was YA No. 1. The preliminary digits which would have made him "00001" were not used in those days.

Records of this young man are very sketchy. His file was long ago destroyed in accordance with Youth Authority policy and only a few case details remain in the Department's archives. Tod and Vi Hodgson are probably about the best repositories of information available about YA I. Aside from their recollections, they have kept a large file of dog-eared news clippings about the case. As it happened, both were employed at the Preston School during the 1940's for part of the time that YA I was there.

Neither Vi nor Tod was yet at Preston when YA I first made his appearance there, on Aug. 17, 1942. The youth's case was well-known in Northern California at that time, although the details have long since been forgotten by the public. He had been arrested after shooting an uncle during a quarrel over ranch chores—the shooting coming after years of physical abuse—and was subsequently convicted of second degree murder and sent to San Quentin. At 14, he was the penitentiary's youngest inmate and was also credited with being the world's youngest "lifer."

It was YA I's good fortune to be beginning his prison term at almost the same time that the Youth Authority was coming into existence. A strong movement among correctional authorities and members of the public soon developed to get the future YA I out of San Quentin. Among those who joined in the effort were the famed Father Flanagan of Boys Town and the equally storied Clinton Duffy of San Quentin. Finally, Governor Olson commuted the boy's life sentence and ordered him transferred to Preston as the new California Youth Correction Authority's first official ward.

The order was warmly greeted by the public and received considerable editorial support. The San Francisco Call Bulletin wrote: "There is instinctive realization among us all that a prison like San Quentin is no place for a

youngster. He would associate with hardened criminals there and would soon be a hardened criminal himself—which definitely is not the purpose of imprisonment for crime. Surely California should provide its own system of youth redemption. . .

"Now, the Preston School has a splendid opportunity to carry on the vital work of youth salvage, which the case of (YA 1) has been brought to public attention. . .

"Public concern for this boy has served a good purpose. It prevented the making of a grievous mistake, by getting him out of San Quentin and into an institution where he will have a chance to redeem himself and prepare for an honest and useful place in society."

The boy's departure from San Quentin was featured in all of the San Francisco newspapers and there were photos showing him, neat and smiling and dressed in a sharp single-breasted suit, striding away from the gray walls of the penitentiary in the company of Warden Duffy, Harold Slane, a pioneer member of the Youth Authority Board, and a convict who befriended him. The boy told reporters his stay at San Quentin wasn't all that bad. Frightened and underweight when he was first imprisoned, he had gained 20 pounds in less than half a year, he said, and would miss the convicts who had been kind to him.

"I've been very happy here," he said. "Everybody has been swell to me. The guards are all swell guys and Mr. Duffy has been fine."

The boy's arrival at Preston was eagerly awaited by the fledgling Youth Authority Board, which had voted to accept him after the Governor's commutation order.

"We have never seen the boy," said O. H. Close, chairman of the board. "We are taking him as a matter of routine because of the recommendations of the Governor, the superior court judge who sentenced him and the Board of Prison Terms and Paroles." He said the youngster, when he arrived, would undergo extensive diagnosis to determine where he would eventually be placed.

#### *Castner's Diagnosis*

As it happened, the diagnosis was to be conducted by Dr. Burt Castner, one of the nation's most eminent clinical psychologists, who that very week had left his post in a New Jersey correctional home for boys to come to the new California Youth Correction Authority. For more than a month, Dr. Castner delved deeply into the boy's background, conducted exhaustive tests and finally came to the conclusion that he had "a wholesome point of view and normal youth reactions, considering his background." He recommended that he be transferred to the Nelles School in Whittier. The Nelles School, like the Preston School and the Ventura School for Girls, had just come under the jurisdiction of the California Youth Correction Authority. And so, in early October, 1942, the boy, now officially designated "YA 1," was transferred to the institution in Southern California.

Whittier was selected because it housed most of the younger offenders under the jurisdiction of the new Youth Authority. Awaiting YA 1 at Nelles was the superintendent, Paul McKusick, another legendary Youth Authority official who served the Department in a variety of executive capacities until his retirement in the early 1970's.

McKusick, who is hearty and hale at his Sacramento home, remembers YA 1 well. He was, he recalls, a cocky youth, full of mischief and sometimes

irrepressible. He had grown up in a difficult family background which continued to affect his behavior until he finally matured.

Maturation, however, did not come during his first months at the Nelles School. In July, 1943, nine months after he arrived at Nelles, he escaped from the school and was not heard from again for more than two years—a climactic time in U.S. history. During the period that YA I was at large, Mussolini was overthrown in Italy, U.S. forces landed in Normandy, the Battle of the Bulge was fought and won, Hitler died in his Berlin bunker, Germany surrendered, Franklin D. Roosevelt died and was succeeded by Harry Truman, and the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. On Sept. 12, less than two weeks after General MacArthur presided over Japan's surrender in Tokyo Bay, YA I was arrested in Las Vegas, Nev., and was identified as a runaway from the Youth Authority.

When he was returned to the diagnostic clinic and later to the Preston School—at 18 he was now too old to go back to Nelles—he told authorities that after escaping two years earlier he had made his way to Phoenix, Ariz., where he spent two years working as a bellhop. He had registered for the draft and shortly thereafter, with \$300 in savings, he moved on to Las Vegas in hopes of making a "killing." The effort failed; he was arrested as a vagrant and was identified as a YA runaway after his fingerprints were taken.

When YA I was returned to Preston, among the people who now met him for the first time were Tod Hodgson, a young clinical psychologist who worked for Dr. Castner, and Vi Brayovich, a supervising clerk—Tod and Vi were not married at that time. Both remember YA I clearly.

"He was a nice kid," Tod recalled. "He was cheerful and adjusted well. He worked as our office boy."

Vi remembers that she "enjoyed him thoroughly. We looked on him almost as though he were one of the staff."

The youth's relatively trouble-free second stint at Preston was culminated after 1½ years when the Board approved a 90-day referral to Camp Whitmore, near Redding, as a prelude to parole. In May of 1947, he was transferred to Whitmore and several months later, he was sent home on parole.

There, the sketchy records show, all did not go well, although by this time, there was no longer much press attention to his case. As Tod Hodgson remembers it, YA I, now a young man, returned to his home on the California coast, became involved with a woman, got drunk a number of times. No serious crime was committed, but Bob Harvey, chief of parole services for Northern California, was dissatisfied with his parole performance. Harvey, another legendary YA administrator who is now in his 80's and makes his home in Sacramento, returned YA I to the Board which ordered him sent back to Camp Whitmore. The date was Sept. 9, 1948—just two months before Harry Truman was elected to his second term as president.

YA I's superintendent now was Tom Montgomery, a one-time Stanford and Olympic athlete who later, like Hodgson, became a Board Representative and served the Department for three decades.

Tom, who recently retired and makes his home in Upland, remembers YA I clearly, as does his wife, Irena, although precise dates and details have been blurred by the passage of time.

When YA I was at Camp Whitmore, he worked for a time as the Montgelors' houseboy and babysitter. Despite the youth's criminal background, Tom and Irena had no qualms whatever about letting YA I take

care of their baby daughter.

"He was a lovely boy," Mrs. Montgomery recalled. "He was intelligent and cheerful, and we were very fond of him."

Despite this assessment, the youth's stay at Camp Whitmore was not always smooth. During one brief period of parole, he obtained a job as a busboy at a Chico hotel and soon was in trouble with the law again after stealing a car, Tom recalled. He was returned to Camp Whitmore for a brief period, but soon was paroled again—this time for good.

Tom and Irena stayed in touch with YA 1 for some years after that. Their recollection of exact dates and places have been blurred somewhat by the passage of time, but they remember that he was married early in the 1950's to a woman with two children, and that he visited them a few years later when the Montgomerys were in Preston, this time with seven small children in tow, some indication that YA 1 had managed to keep busy during his first years on parole. YA 1 and the Montgomerys exchanged Christmas cards for a number of years, the last time about 15 years ago, Tom recalled. Since then, they have had no contact with YA 1, although Montgomery said he has an impression that he moved to San Jose and became a hod carrier.

#### *Last CYA Contact*

YA 1 had his last contact with a large group of Youth Authority staff in the mid-1950's, when he attended a retirement dinner in Jackson for William Evans, an early-day administrator of the Department who was generally known as "Major" Evans. The title was a carry-over from the days when Mr. Evans was an officer at the Benicia arsenal, an army installation which for a time housed a number of YA wards. After Major Evans left the army, he joined the Youth Authority, and was head group supervisor at Camp Whitmore during the time that YA 1 was there. "Major" Evans, who is now deceased, and YA 1 apparently became good friends and YA 1 thought enough of the major to accept an invitation to his retirement dinner.

Arrangements were made for John Solaja, a Youth Authority veteran who is now parole supervisor at the San Fernando Valley office, to pick up YA 1 in San Jose on his way to Jackson. John, at that time, was superintendent of the Ben Lomond camp, and San Jose was right on his way.

The trip to Jackson and back was the first and last time that John saw YA 1. He remembers little of the trip now except that he had a favorable impression of the young man, whose age, at the time, he estimated at 28. "He spoke very highly of Major Evans," John said, "and I had an impression that Major Evans played an important part in turning him around. I think he said he was a carpenter in San Jose and it appeared to me that he had made a very good adjustment."

There is little additional information about YA 1 in the meager records which were not expunged many years ago. One notes that YA 1's mother died early in 1949, and that the Board ordered Superintendent Montgomery to advance money to the young man from his trust fund, so that he could attend the funeral.

On March 11, 1949, he was again referred to parole and seven weeks later he was released—this time for the last time.

YA 1 remained under the Department's jurisdiction for more than three more years, this time on parole. On March 3, 1950, a report was received indicating that he had married at the age of 22. The final entry in the record was dated Sept. 19, 1952. It stated that his record on parole was good and that he was approved for

honorable discharge from parole. He was, by this time, almost 25 years of age and had been under the jurisdiction of the Youth Authority for 10 years and 1 month, a length of time which may be something of a record in itself. He was a Youth Authority ward from the days that the U.S. Marines landed in Guadalcanal through post-war reconstruction to the time that General Eisenhower was campaigning against Adlai Stevenson for the presidency. He had spent all of his teen years and the first half of his 20's under the jurisdiction of the Youth Authority, but as the fall of 1952 approached, this lengthy wardship was at last at an end.

What has happened to him since is a mystery. Paul McKusick recalled he once heard that he had done lumbering work in the Redding area and had later moved to the Bay Area. Tod Hodgson said he had heard something once about his operating a cigar store in Oakland. Both mentioned hearing that he had had several children, although it was possible they were his wife's by a prior marriage. Then, of course, there is also Tom Montgomery's recollection of seven children, along with his and John Solaja's report that YA 1 had lived in San Jose. But all of these reports do not go past the 1950's, and it appears that the YA has had no contact with him for the better part of the past two decades.

Several abortive efforts to locate him during recent years have been unsuccessful. Most people who were interested in his case in years past feel that YA 1 finally "made it"—there is a strong impression that after having committed a serious crime as a boy, and after being an unstable and difficult adolescent as he grew toward manhood, he finally matured and became a law-abiding citizen. But that is just conjecture; yet this is the hope.

This hope, as it revolves around YA 1, is the same hope that the Department has extended to all of the more than 125,000 boys and girls, young men and women, who have been committed to the Youth Authority over the 37 years since its inception. It is a hope that is sometimes realized; sometimes not. But it is a hope that is central to the Department's existence. In carrying out its programs of training and treatment, and hopefully rehabilitation, the Department has always, and must continue to, regard its wards as young people who can be restored to a productive and law-abiding life.

YA 1 was the first, but he led the way for the rest. I hope that now, having reached the pinnacle of middle age, he is well and is prospering. And if he is, he could be the beacon of hope for all of the thousands that have followed him.

## STEPS ON THE PATH TO REALITY

BY RAY SMITH

*Mr. Smith is a reporter for the Santa Rosa Press Democrat*

This article, reprinted by permission from the Feb. 18, 1979, issue of the Santa Rosa Press Democrat, gives a detailed account of a camp operated by Sonoma County for young offenders. It is a camp whose staff tries especially hard to help its clientele so that they do not return or move up to the California Youth Authority.

"You can't make change, but you can create an environment for change." The statement reflects the basic philosophy of a unique, little known Sonoma County program aimed at changing the lives of youth in trouble with the law.<sup>1</sup>

The philosophy—counter to one held by law and order advocates that long prison terms are the only answer for lawbreakers because rehabilitation measures haven't helped in the past—is working for 16 to 18-year-olds at the county probation department's youth camp.

Charles Kutsis, one of seven supervisors at the camp in a rural setting east of Forestville, summed up the philosophy during a recent staff meeting.

He said, "there's got to be change" for a youth to progress at the probation department facility.

If they don't change, a normal four to six month stay at the camp can be extended, or they may face harsher treatment, such as a term at institutions operated by the California Youth Authority.

For most of the youth there is a change.

The camp enjoys a 75 to 85 percent success rate, according to superintendent Frank McAtee.

By success he means youths who complete the program and are able to function in the community.

McAtee and camp supervisors attribute the rate of success to an "environment" that includes:

- Not more than 20 youths committed to the program by juvenile judges with screening by a probation officer and camp staff.
- Constant counseling by the staff on a ratio of about three adults to one youth that also includes the youth's family while in the program and after release.
- Education and job, vocational, or career planning or advice on entering the military or other public agency.
- Good personal hygiene habits such as haircuts (done by a barber from juvenile hall on a volunteer basis), and daily showers. Youths also are required to keep their clothes, beds and lockers in neat order.
- Physical education and cultural and recreation opportunities that include movies and stage shows, day trips and outings such as backpacking in nearby mountains.

<sup>1</sup> Three months after this article was written, the Sonoma County youth camp was selected as recipient of the 1979 CYA award for institutional services.

All funds for outside activities are earned by the youths in work projects. McAtee stressed that involvement depends on progress, which is checked daily by camp supervisors. The supervisor involved with the youth makes a recommendation before the activity is approved.

• Pleasant surroundings. The "camp" is actually two structures on the wooded knoll of a nine-acre site in the same area as the Ya-Ka-Ama Indian facility and Santa Rosa Junior College farm.

One building, looking much like an expensive redwood-sided home from the outside, houses a kitchen, lounge, two sleeping areas of 10 beds each, an administration center, and bathroom and shower facilities. There also is a large redwood deck built by the boys that over-looks a valley. They also have built a rock barbecue and several storage sheds.

The other building houses a wood and metal shop which has materials for projects donated by industries.

There are no locks, bars, or fences. Youths can run away, and some do.

This facility opened in 1972, but the camp program has been in operation for 15 years.

The environment also includes camp maintenance and work projects. Maintenance projects might include kitchen work and building and grounds cleanup.

Work projects are of two types: public service; or for pay, with money earned kept in a trust fund for use to buy camp equipment such as a television and stereo set, or for outside events and activities.

According to McAtee, public service projects for such agencies as county and state parks, the probation, mental health or sheriff's departments, the county hospital or office of education have included construction as well as landscaping and maintenance work.

He says such jobs have saved taxpayers thousands of dollars.

There are three work projects for pay. One is cutting wood from fallen trees on public lands that is offered for sale by the cord. The other two involve Optical Engineering of Healdsburg, which uses lasers to make desk sets and other decorative items for offices and homes.

The company uses walnut to make the items and youths at the camp cut the wood to the desired size with a saw in the facility's wood-metal shop. In addition, the company gives the camp wood that otherwise would be wasted. This is bagged, and sold to county and state parks for use by campers. The bags cost \$1.50, with the parks departments retaining 50 cents.

In praising the company for its cooperation, McAtee says it also has employed several youths after completion of their camp stay.

He says he is seeking the cooperation of other industries that can offer the youths employment and hopes to soon form an advisory committee of business and industry leaders willing to offer assistance.

Youths at the camp also are involved in a year-around garden project in which about a third of the camp's food is raised, and in caring for pigs at the Santa Rosa Junior College farm.

McAtee says youths are currently building a 20- by 50-foot greenhouse, and through the cooperation of 4-H leaders are raising rabbits.

"We'd like to raise more of our own food," says McAtee, "but we can't expand too much because we need a larger freezer." The one they have now is about the size found in the average home, he adds.

When not involved in work projects, youths are going to school, spending half their time every day in the classroom or shop.

The county Office of Education provides two instructors, Gene Scott for academic subjects and Herb Keck, vocational and shop teacher.

Scott says reading and mathematics is stressed, but other subjects include English, history, science and driver education.

"The program is tailored to each youth's level of learning so he can experience progress without competition from others.

"Most of the guys here have hated school, and one reason is competition. They haven't been able to hack it because of real, physical learning disabilities or family and social problems, or a combination of both.

"They lack self-esteem and think they are failures because most get little attention at home or school. They don't have good behavioral patterns and don't want to accept responsibility for themselves or their actions."

Establishing self-esteem, good behavioral patterns and responsibility are basic to the camp "creating an environment for change" program, according to McAtee, Beiden, Kutsis and supervisors James DeJoria and Paul Thornton, all of whom work with the boys during the day. Chet Locke and Frank Abruo are night youth supervisors.

"Most of the boys here come from a low-income environment, broken homes usually with the father missing, the whole bit," says McAtee.

"They have quit or dropped out of school, been in trouble with the law mostly as burglars or car thieves, have alcohol or drug problems, primarily marijuana.

"They have built a wall around themselves because of their problems and failures. They tell us about it in an attitude of 'poor me.'

"We say, yes, that's bad, you've had it tough. But now, what are you going to do about it? What are you going to do for yourself?

"And we help chip away that wall. Break it down, and get them started at doing something for themselves. Once they start changing, accepting responsibility and the other things, they usually succeed.

"That's one of the pluses of this program, seeing the boy succeed. It's a great satisfaction for all us, who, by the way, are here because we want to be here. We like the work and the challenge, and often staff members are either here on their days off, or talking to the parents. A staff member or two are always with boys on outings and we all help on work projects."

There are at least three other factors working to bring about change in the program.

One is the fact the youths know the camp is the last step in the county probation department choices of dealing with teen-agers. If they fail there, the next stop is the CYA.

Another factor is peer pressure. The youths who have been in the program for a few weeks don't want new arrivals "screwing up" and jeopardizing things they've earned like outings and furloughs, or seeing camp rules suddenly become more stringent.

"Yes," says McAtee, "the boys get furloughs to go home or see another responsible adult."

The furloughs, from 12 to 48 hours or more, depend on progress.

It is a five-step program carefully drawn in contract form that is explained to the youth and his family, then signed. The youth must progress through certain provisions in each step before he can be released.

There also is provision in the general camp program for working with the youth and his family after release.

"We are working to especially improve this program, which we feel is very beneficial to both the youth and his parents," says McAtee.

"The program is a very fundamental and basic one in which we are trying to create a system that is predictable and definable, McAtee adds. "Even so, we have failures and runaways, perhaps two on the average a month."

If a youth does run away, time is added to his stay. And if he breaks the law, either at camp or on furlough, usually 30 days is added.

"We say usually because every case is judged individually," explains McAtee. "He may get more or less, it depends on attitude and progress. Some have been here up to 14 months."

On runaways, McAtee says the staff doesn't like them and tries to screen them from the program along with those with severe drug dependency or youths having mental or physical disorders.

The screening is done at weekly Thursday staff meetings, where each boy's progress is checked. Sitting in on these sessions are the probation officer assigned to the camp, and often Ernest Baily from the Sonoma County Drug Abuse Council. He drops by to be available to the youths whenever possible.

McAtee says the camp is the smallest probation unit in the state, "which is one key to its success," and the least expensive of all commitment programs.

It costs about \$800 a month to house a youth there, he says, while institutional costs run more than \$1,000.

The budget for the camp last year was \$200,159 and this year it's \$208,108. The state kicks in \$22,500 a year of the total.

In addition, parents pay for part of the cost, figured on an ability to pay basis.

McAtee says the county wanted to raise the scale parents pay this year, but on his recommendation the plan was dropped in favor of youths committed paying for extra costs out of earnings from work projects.

He sees the recommendation as another small link in the camp program of getting the youths to accept responsibility.

Chuck Kutsis would call it part of the program environment to create change.

You might call it, more simply, one of the steps along a path leading to facing reality.

## CHINATOWN YOUTH GANGS—PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

BY JOSEPH MORICI AND DENNIS FLANDERS

*Mr. Morici is a Youth Authority parole agent in San Francisco. Mr. Flanders has been a professional and volunteer worker in Chinatown for 12 years and is past recreation coordinator of the Chinatown Youth Service Center*

The development of gangs in Chinatown has had a recent sharp impact on crime and delinquency in the San Francisco community. Origin of the gangs and prospects for the future are explored by the writers.

One of the more startling population trends in the Youth Authority during the past 10 years has been the increase in commitment of youths of Asian extraction. From a total of just three in 1968, the number increased 13-fold by 1977 to 39, dropping slightly to 35 in 1978. This increase, coming at a time when Youth Authority populations in general were dropping, has been interpreted as being a direct reflection of the growing rate of juvenile gang violence among Chinese youths, largely in San Francisco's Chinatown.

The Youth Authority, as a part of the state's juvenile justice system, has been extremely interested in the background and the unique dynamics of this growing problem. It is a problem which threatens not only the small community of Chinatown, but the broader community in which we all live—a universal community which seeks peace and freedom from violence. The story of Chinatown's gang warfare reached its climax in the 1977 Golden Dragon "massacre," an event which put Chinatown on the front pages of every newspaper in the nation.

Following is the story of Chinatown's gangs—past, present and future:

The Golden Dragon restaurant in San Francisco's Chinatown was rapidly filling up with customers—nearly 100 customers—at 2 a.m. Sunday, September 4, 1977. Some of them were tourists from other cities, such as Seattle and Los Angeles, who were spending the Labor Day weekend in San Francisco and had enjoyed an evening in the night clubs and cabarets on Broadway and in nearby North Beach. Others were local residents who had just come from the bars and discotheques in Chinatown. Small groups of Asian youths were seated at various tables and booths in the restaurant. Everyone was getting something to eat before going home or back to their hotel rooms to sleep.

About ten miles away a dozen Chinese youths, commonly known as "Joe Boys", were sitting in a house in Daly City waiting for a telephone call. A few minutes later the phone rang. The message was short. "The Wah Ching are at the Golden Dragon," the caller said. Five youths left the house, got into two cars, and headed north into San Francisco. One of the drivers was 16, the other, 23. Three 17-year-old youths rode with the younger driver. They were holding two shotguns, a .38 caliber revolver, and a .45 caliber semi-automatic rifle, all loaded.

At 2:40 a.m. the diners in the Golden Dragon noticed that something strange was happening inside the front entrance. They saw three young males wearing stocking masks and holding guns. The three gunmen quickly spread out, pointed

their guns directly at the surprised diners, and opened fire. Within minutes police cars, ambulances, and television news vans converged on the restaurant. The gunmen were gone.

Five people died and 11 were wounded, some critically, in what became known as the "Golden Dragon massacre." Most of the dead and seriously wounded were young Asians—college students, law students, church members. The other young Asian diners, who had escaped death and injury by ducking under tables, were the Wah Ching—the target of the assault.

The Golden Dragon massacre was not a spontaneous or isolated incident. It was a planned and coordinated effort by the Joe Boys to destroy the leadership of the Wah Ching—their rival gang. The fact was that the assault totally missed its target, and innocent people were tragically gunned down.

All but one of the Joe Boys who took part, directly or indirectly, in the massacre have since been apprehended. Some testified in court against the others. Based on their sworn testimony, as well as the beliefs of the police and the district attorney as stated in court, the effort to eliminate the Wah Ching leadership by killing them in the Golden Dragon restaurant was a retaliatory move for an incident which occurred just two months earlier. On July 4, 1977 the Joe Boys and the Wah Ching had clashed in a series of gun fights that left one dead and three wounded—mostly Joe Boys—in front of the Middle Ping Yuen housing project in Chinatown. No one had been arrested by the time of the Golden Dragon incident.

The July 4 battle also was not a spontaneous or isolated incident. Every year a large number of Chinese youths sell firecrackers and other fireworks illegally to tourists in Chinatown during the first few weeks of summer vacation. These young "salesmen" usually earn enough money to buy an automobile, motorcycle, or stereo, as well as to take a vacation out of town or put some money in the bank. The Joe Boys and the Wah Ching extort them every year, and the payoff for "protection" from both sides usually amounts to thousands of dollars, they claim. "It's just like paying taxes," said one of the young salesmen. "Since it's illegal, we don't have to pay taxes to the government for their army and police that they say are protecting us. But we have to pay those other guys instead. They don't take as much though."

Inevitably, the two opposing gangs come into conflict, sometimes violently, over the spoils of this extortion racket. According to some of the youths involved, as well as the police, the shootings that left three wounded and one dead on July 4, 1977 were a direct result of that conflict.

Nearly 30 people were shot in Chinese gang-related attacks in San Francisco in 1977, and over one-third of those victims died—the worst year so far in terms of Chinese gang violence. Previously, the worst year had been 1972, when four people were killed in three months, including Barry Fong-Torres, the Director of the Youth Services and Coordinating Center, a Chinatown agency that was attempting to work with the gangs.

Since the murder of Fong-Torres, youth workers and other social workers in Chinatown have been understandably hesitant to get involved in working with the gangs. This left a vacuum in which only the police were operating, and they were relatively uncoordinated and ineffective until the formation of the Gang Task Force in response to the Golden Dragon massacre more than five years later.

The Chinese gang situation in San Francisco is currently in a fluid state. Numerous Joe Boys, including some of the leaders, have been arrested and

convicted in the Golden Dragon case. At the same time, many Wah Ching, again including some of the leaders, have been arrested and convicted of charges ranging from murder and assault to extortion and the sale of narcotics. This has created a partial vacuum in the gang structure on both sides.

As a result of the incarceration of many of the more violent and influential members of both sides, the situation appears relatively quiet on the surface. However, there are rumblings of competition between the gangs to recruit new members and to jockey for positions of strength in terms of territory and connections.

Although no gang-related killings have taken place in over a year and a half, there have been frequent gang-related assaults, armed robberies, and extortions. Despite a fairly high rate of arrests and convictions in these cases, due primarily to the creation of the Gang Task Force, the crime rate among Chinese gangs continues unchecked because of the continuing recruitment of young immigrants into these gangs.

The existence of juvenile delinquency in San Francisco's Chinese community can be traced back to the 1940's. From 1943 until 1949 a total of 184 Chinese were referred to juvenile court. Most of them were American-born boys charged with larceny, assault, auto theft, burglary, and armed robbery.

The 1960's saw a significant upsurge in Chinese juvenile crime. In 1961 alone a total of 73 Chinese were referred to juvenile court. In 1964 the number of referrals climbed to 158, and 1966 saw 180 referrals. The charges were basically the same as in the 1940's and 50's. But the 1960's saw immigrant Chinese juveniles arrested in significant numbers for the first time. They constituted 20% of all Chinese referred to juvenile court in 1961, 22.5% in 1964, and 28% by 1966.

Consequently, this phenomenon of the 1960's manifested itself in two separate and distinct ways: loose groups of American-born Chinese youths who engaged in conventional forms of delinquency, and immigrant Chinese youths who were more disciplined and ultimately formed gangs.

The American-born youths were often truants or dropouts from school who hung out in pool halls and pinball shops, and occasionally committed crimes. More often than not, their motive for the crime was the seeking of adventure, excitement, or a challenge, rather than any real economic need. Quite often, any money or property thus gained was squandered almost as quickly as it was obtained.

Other American-born Chinese youths had parents who were born and raised in San Francisco, and very few of these youths ever appeared in juvenile court. The ability of the American-born parents to understand and deal effectively with the problems of their children in the public schools and in other segments of the American society contributed greatly to the law-abiding behavior of their offspring.

The upsurge in the number of American-born Chinese youths appearing in juvenile court in the 1960's was mostly due to the loosening up, during and after World War II, of the almost total exclusion of Chinese immigration since 1882. More Chinese men were then able to bring over wives, or find women to marry, and raise families. Some of their children, when they reach adolescence in the turbulent 60's, rebelled against the tight, authoritarian Chinese family structure. At the same time, they were able to take advantage of their parents' unfamiliarity and uneasiness with the language, mores, institutions, and authority figures of the dominant American society. Abundant leisure time, lack of chores to

perform at home, public schools that demanded or expected little from the students, easy access to automobiles, firearms, and drugs, and the resultant rate of juvenile delinquency that accounts for nearly half of all crime in the United States, were unheard of in the rural villages and towns of Kwangtung province in southern China where the parents of these youths were born and raised.

Immigrant Chinese youths, on the other hand, experienced even more severe problems than their American-born counterparts in growing up in this society. Consequently, a higher percentage of them became delinquent and joined gangs. Some of these gang members carried their anti-social and criminal behavior into early adulthood as well.

These statements are not meant to create the impression that Chinese youths in general, and immigrant youth in particular, are mostly delinquent and criminal. The overwhelming majority of Chinese youths in San Francisco, both American-born and immigrant, are consistently law-abiding young people. The number of young Chinese arrested by the police account for less than one percent of the total Chinese youth population. While approximately 15% of San Francisco's population is Chinese at this time, the number of Chinese youths in juvenile hall never approaches that percentage.

However, the number of youths responsible for juvenile delinquency and gang warfare in the Chinese community is increasing at a rate faster than the growth rate of the Chinese youth population in general. Ten years ago there usually were no Chinese youths in juvenile hall, and rarely were there more than two or three at the same time. Now there are almost always some Chinese youths in custody there, and occasionally as many as 15 or 20.

The sudden upsurge of Chinese juvenile crime, particularly among immigrant youths, took place in the late 1960's and early 70's. That was also when Chinese gangs, as we know them today, were formed and gang warfare broke out with Chinese youths killing each other for the first time.

The Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965 gave many thousands of Chinese families in Hong Kong and elsewhere an opportunity to come to the United States. As a result, the number of Chinese in this country almost doubled between the 1960 and 1970 census—from 237,292 to 435,062. California still had the highest number in 1970—about 40% of the national total, or 170,131. San Francisco had 58,696 Chinese as of 1970, or about one-third of the state total.

The second half of the 1960's saw young immigrant delinquents become steadily more conspicuous in Chinatown. When they first appeared on the streets, the American-born delinquents ridiculed them and occasionally assaulted them. The new immigrant delinquents responded by organizing themselves into one group for the purpose of self-protection. They called their new group the "Wah Ching", which literally means "Chinese Youth." The Wah Ching were destined to become the first of several gangs of predominately immigrant youths who later clashed with each other in deadly warfare.

The Wah Ching incorporated in 1968 as a self-help group. They turned to the Chinese community and to governmental agencies, asking for their assistance in dealing with their problems and the problems of the countless young street kids coming along in the near future. But they were unable to establish their legitimacy either in Chinatown or downtown; their efforts and pleas met with disinterest, disbelief, and inertia.

In January, 1968, the Wah Ching attended an evening meeting of the Directors of the local Economic Opportunity Council, a federal agency, in

Chinatown. They presented a written proposal calling for a basic education and job training program for immigrant street youths. Their spokesman was Anton Wong, a young immigrant delinquent who later led the frustrated Wah Ching in a series of gang wars. He was destined to be gunned down by a 15-year-old on a Chinatown street in broad daylight about six years later.

The only action the E.O.C. Board took was to listen, to receive the proposal, and to proceed with the other business on their agenda. The Wah Ching's next step was to appear to the San Francisco Human Rights Commission for help in presenting their case before the Chinese community. In February the H.R.C. called a "town hall" meeting in Chinatown. Over 300 people jammed into a small auditorium. Many people, both youths and adults, spoke in favor of the Wah Ching proposal. But again no action was taken.

In March the Wah Ching presented their case directly before the influential Chinese Six Companies (the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association). But the Six Companies did not respond; they refused to help. The Wah Ching were disappointed. They became disillusioned and dispirited. The loose coalition that had come together to form the Wah Ching fractured. The group split apart into personal cliques. One faction, led by Anton Wong, joined the Hop Sing Tong, but retained the name Wah Ching. Another faction joined the Suey Sing Tong and became known as the Suey Sing Boys.

By the end of 1968 the Wah Ching and Suey Sing Boys were at each others' throats. Numerous beatings, stabblings, and shootings took place in 1969. The first fatality came in March, 1970, when a Wah Ching member was ambushed near his home late at night. The police suspected the Suey Sing Boys, but no arrests were ever made.

During the height of the Wah Ching-Suey Sing gang war, in the summer of 1970, a 16-year-old immigrant, with two older brothers in the Wah Ching, was shot in the back on Grant Avenue by the Suey Sing Boys. The youth, Joe Fong, recovered from the gunshot wound and went on to organize a group called the Chung Yi, which stood for "Loyalty and Righteousness." The Chung Yi had a club house and a busy schedule of social and recreational activities for delinquent Chinese youths. The facilities and program were supported by membership dues, and there were rules to be observed, such as no marijuana smoking. The young man who founded the Chung Yi called it a youth group for street kids, but the police and the mass media called it the "Joe Boys" after its founder and leader.

The Joe Boys had fought with the Wah Ching against the Suey Sing Boys. In the summer of 1971, after the Suey Sing Boys had been defeated and had retreated across the Bay to Oakland's Chinatown, a new group called the Yau Lei emerged. The Yau Lei, which stood for "Friendship and Profit", was formed as a coalition of Wah Ching and Joe Boys. But that autumn, at a Yau Lei meeting, an argument erupted involving Joe Fong and a close friend, Raymond Leung, against some Wah Ching Members. The argument reportedly was over the issue of extorting Chinatown businessmen, with Joe Fong in opposition. The meeting broke up, because of the argument, with many hard feelings. The next day Ramond Leung was executed in broad daylight on Grant Avenue by several Wah Ching as horrified tourists looked on. That was in October, 1971. It signaled the start of the Wah Ching-Joe Boys conflict which has continued to the present.

### What Lies Ahead

The Chinatown of the past no longer exists, along with the stereotype of the Chinese character as an obedient and humble servant, who philosophically accepts his fate, maintains his place, and does not question the authority of his ancestors. The Chinatown of yesterday is an epic tale told against a background of another nation's historical development, a tale of determination and despair, malevolence and human majesty, indomitable will and muted triumphs. Sheer survival became a quiet victory that nurtured the immigrant's quest for ethnic identity, be he sojourner or permanent settler. There are many (students and sociologists) who have observed that Chinatown inhabitants now are in a critical stage of transition and the gang wars are symptomatic of the conflict within and without its boundaries. Its people continue to struggle against racism and those who would deny them their basic educational, economic and social rights as citizens of the U.S.

In Chinatown today, the factional strife within goes on, but by most accounts there has been progress, and positive change is reflected in the community's awareness and effort. Mr. Frank Wong, editor and publisher of the *Truth Semi-Weekly*, a Chinatown newspaper, describes Chinatown as a safer place for everybody through the efforts of the Gang Task Force, Youth Guidance Center, Youth Service Coordinating Center, California Youth Authority, and other community agencies in Chinatown. A successful businessman in the community explains, "Chinatown's problems can no longer be handled with an attitude of 'We can take care of our own,' they go beyond the Six Companies, beyond the family associations and must come to rest on the desks of the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors and before the community at large. We are all to be held responsible."

In our many interviews, particularly with past and present gang members, we were repeatedly told that being labeled as Wah Ching or Joe Boys was primarily a matter of convenience for the authorities and the media. Gang cohesion no longer exists as it once did under formidable leadership. Many past leaders have been killed or are in prison.

However, as one well-known jurist describes it, "Murders, assaults and robberies require effective law enforcement. I only hope we are not creating, by our ignorance, a new generation of criminals. Over the years, working with these youths, on the bench and in front of it, I have seen five generations of gangs. But I have faith in two things: our judicial system based on English common law, and the inherent goodness of man, as a God-given attribute."

On the other side of that proverbial coin, are the grim observations of high school teachers in one of our major cities: nine out of ten did not feel that gang activities would lessen in the next several years, half predicted that things would get worse. The mother of a slain Chinese youth states, "Until some solution is found to the problem of youth gang violence, we are all potential victims."

There are some who question the continued existence of Chinatown as we know it today. Some see it as a ghetto, carrying the seed of its own destruction. Perhaps the future of Chinatown's inhabitants, in its search for Chinese-American identity, is best described by L. Ling-chi Wang in his essay, *Chinatown in Transition*: "We have a long history and a rich culture. We want to build a new community that is truly ours, not the one that caters only to tourism. As a minority group in the U.S., and a decisive majority race in the world, our people have a unique and important role in the history of this country and the destiny of the human race."

## EDUCATION IN THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

In this issue I have written at length about DeWitt Nelson Training Center—one of three institutions at the Northern California Youth Center in Stockton.

Though I am well aware of the many good programs which exist in all of our institutions, I chose to write about DeWitt Nelson for two reasons.

Opened in 1971, DeWitt Nelson is the newest YA institution and does not have the kind of tradition that marks some of the older and more established institutions. Nevertheless, DeWitt Nelson enjoys the privilege of being the product of the YA's many years of institutional experience and its best thinking. It is, moreover, the product of a changing society with its emphasis on making schools reflect the demands and needs of a job market.

Secondly, I chose DeWitt Nelson because I saw a unique situation in which one third of the wards leave each morning to go to work. This phenomenon, which I found intriguing, means that DeWitt Nelson has at its doorstep a mini-job market, not only within the NCYC complex but beyond and into the community.

Fred Torrisi  
Education Editor

## EDUCATION NEWS BRIEFS

### *A Day For Reading*

A noted authority in the field of reading emphasized teaching reading by bringing in various objects in class.

Dr. Margaret Lynch, professor at San Francisco State University, spoke at "A Day for Reading" in-service training at El Paso de Robles School April 20. "People learn to read through the association of words with objects," she said to some 120 people who attended. Dr. Lynch also said that the act of learning to read involves learning to recognize groups of words or sentences, not just words.

The training, which was coordinated by Reading Specialist Judy Weiss, was open to the public, and among those who attended were teachers from California Polytechnic State University, Cuesta Community College, the Department of Corrections and public school teachers from the surrounding area.

The afternoon offered six workshops in the areas of bilingual education, reading in the content area, Public Law 94-142, the Language Experience Approach to Reading, Reading Diagnosis and Prescription, and the Use of Readability Formulas.

Dave Crosson, Right to Read coordinator for the Youth Authority, was among the guest speakers who included Dr. Margaret Glaser, California Polytechnic State University; James Ward, Mission Community College District, County Jails Project; Madalena Bastos, coordinator, Libraries Involved in Bilingual Education; and Bob Cole, Santa Clara County Schools.

### *New Approach in GED Preparation*

A new approach in preparing students to take the General Education Diploma examination has been implemented recently at the Mt. Bullion Conservation Youth Camp, according to Dennis Baker, director of education.

It is called the Saturation Testing Program, and Baker said the method incorporates pre-testing on three different GED predictive test batteries, followed by placement into those areas of deficiency indicated from the pre-testing.

Said Baker, "The 15 hours of saturation testing helps familiarize the student with the types of questions he faces on the actual GED exam. In addition, the three tests in each of the five GED subject areas help to pinpoint areas of deficiency and allow for greater concentration on these areas. This eliminates unnecessary study."

The three pre-tests being used are the General Educational Performance Index (GEPI) from Steck-Vaughn and the two tests from the GED Institute: the GED Practice Test and the Half-Length Predictive Test. Scores achieved on the predictive tests have been shown to reflect fairly accurately the potential range of students' scores on the actual test.

Since the Saturation Testing Program was begun, seven of the eight students referred for the monthly GED tests have successfully passed them, Baker said. In the one unsuccessful attempt, the examinee scored 224 points, one short of the 225 required to pass the test.

According to Baker, the new program has allowed more accurate assessment, shorter remediation programming and more time-effective studying. The ability

to handle the pre-tests also gives the student the confidence and belief he can pass the actual GED exam.

It is too early to see how effective the program will be, he said, but as the number of examinees increases "we hope for a better than 75 percent success rate on those referred for the test."

### **New College Program at SRCC**

The Southern Reception Center-Clinic in Norwalk has recently joined the list of Youth Authority institutions that now have college programs. Those that already have them include the Youth Training School, El Paso de Robles, Karl Holton and Ventura.

Responsible for starting the SRCC college program is Youth Counselor Xavier Lee Ray with the help of a privately owned video tape recorder.

Lee Ray works in the Marshall unit, one of three medical-psychiatric programs conducted by the YA. Fifteen of Marshall's wards are currently enrolled in the first semester of what will hopefully become a permanent, ongoing college. Courses offered are the history of Mexico, English I and contemporary health issues.

The nucleus of the program is the video presentation of classroom lectures by the Cerritos College faculty. These are aired regularly by a local TV station at 6 a.m., recorded by Lee Ray who tapes them and then shows them at the SRCC classes.

The beginning program has strong support and participation from Program Administrator Joe Henry and School Psychologist Ida Stolk, as well as one-to-one tutoring by two EOP instructors from Cerritos, Kay Elias and Michael French. Ms. Elias and French come to the Southern Clinic when the classes are held, tutor the students and participate in group discussions after the TV tapes are shown.

## **EDUCATION OUTSIDE THE CYA**

### ***Colleges, Students in Moral Slumps***

Cheating, stealing, misuse of student financial aid, grade-inflation and misleading advertising are creating a growing ethical crisis in American colleges and universities, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education warned.

"Most institutions of higher education, to a small or large degree, exhibit one or more of these destructive aspects," the council said in a 96-page report which was discussed recently in Washington at the annual meeting of the American Association of Higher Education.

The situation is of special concern right now, the council said, because of the prospective frantic search by many faculty members, many departments, and many colleges for more students in the 1980s and 1990s.

The report said 13 percent of the student loans made by one federal program and 17 percent of another are in default, and the rate of nonrepayment of veterans' loans is 44 percent. Almost 22,000 student borrowers filed for bankruptcy to avoid repaying loans, it said.

"With regard to cheating, 8.8 percent of undergraduates report that some forms of cheating are necessary to get the grades they want. That is an increase of

1.3 percentage points since 1969," the council said.

The council also said a survey found that theft and mutilation of periodicals is a serious problem at 80 percent of the institutions studied.

Despite the problems, the report said higher education has greatly expanded equality of opportunity. It said the percentage of blacks enrolled in colleges and universities increased from 4.6 percent in 1967 to 10.7 percent in 1976, women from 34.9 percent to 43.2 percent and low-income from 20 to 22.4 percent.

### ***Fewer Blacks Quit High School***

The Census Bureau said recently the dropout rate among black high school students fell substantially in recent years and the number of blacks attending college more than doubled.

The bureau said that among blacks aged 18 to 24, the number who left high school without graduating fell from 35 percent in 1967 to 24 percent in 1977. The rate for white youths over the same period went from 18 percent to 15 percent.

More blacks also started college in the 1970s increasing their proportion on campus from 7 percent or half a million students in 1970 to 11 percent—1.1 million—in 1977.

"Current enrollment rates suggest that the difference between black and white high school graduation levels will decrease further in the next 10 years," the bureau said.

### ***Teaching the Basics at the Expense of Science***

Teachers are emphasizing basic skills in reading and math at the expense of the traditional science curriculum, a recently published study from the University of Illinois shows. The study was funded by the National Science Foundation.

According to the study, which examined 11 U.S. school districts, most teachers feel the most pressing needs are to teach simpler and more general skills and vocabulary, to prepare students for future courses and responsibilities, and to develop their sense of responsibility and adherence to the work ethic.

In science, the teachers studied are gearing their courses more toward the basics and less toward personal experience, scientific inquiry, or the complex scientific ideas and problems of the day.

### ***Young Adults Have Opinions But Slight Information on Energy***

U.S. adults aged 26 to 35 lack the knowledge to make informed decisions on energy issues, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The average proportion of correct responses to 50 key energy knowledge questions is 49 percent.

Young adults believe energy problems are very serious and have strong feelings about the necessity of energy conservation, the environmental hazards associated with some alternative energy sources, and the trade-offs to consider as alternative sources are developed.

## DEWITT NELSON TRAINING CENTER— INculcating the "Work Ethic"

By FRED TORRISI

*Mr. Torrisi, formerly a teacher, is an information officer in the Youth Authority*

If you approach DeWitt Nelson Training Center in Stockton before 8 a.m. any weekday, you'll notice an obvious difference from the other two nearby CYA schools—Karl Holton and O.H. Close. All three look alike, identified by the one-story buildings that resemble prep schools more than institutions for youthful offenders. Each is surrounded by a tall, chain link fence, but it is only at DeWitt Nelson that you see scores of wards leaving the gates at that time of the morning.

Though they seem unsupervised, the bulk of them won't leave the Northern California Youth Center—the CYA complex that includes administration, hospital and other services that administer to the three institutions. Others will be driven in state cars to Stockton. Altogether, about 150, or one-third, of the ward population of 350 leave the institution to spend the rest of the day as painters, maintenance workers, electricians, janitors, cooks, gardeners, laundry men and fire fighters.

The wards who are left behind will participate in either a culinary program or attend school to upgrade reading and math skills and to learn entry-level occupational skills.

Such a situation in which a third of the wards leave for work assignments while two thirds are left behind may at first seem odd to the casual observer—much like the "haves" and the "have-nots." But behind the apparent discrepancy, there is unity of purpose and a sound educational philosophy.

According to Supervisor of Education Jim Flynn, the situation is unique. "We have an older guy," he said, "but he's not sent here because he's a skilled technician. We have work furloughs, and we maintain a strong liaison with the community. But the main education program is the development of entry-level skills."

One of the myths surrounding DeWitt Nelson since its opening in 1971 is the belief that a ward can pick up an apprenticeship or learn a complete trade.

Said Flynn, "It's the difference between ideal and reality. We do have some apprenticeships that allow a kid to continue it when he gets out. But, basically, all we're set up to do is take a guy, have him develop some beginning skills in a field, and then move him out with one of the tradesmen at NCYC."

Don Detling, CYA education administrator, agrees. "What's unique about DeWitt," he said, "is the opportunity wards have to develop a wide variety of skills, rather than concentrate on vocational training in a narrow area. The center attempts to give the ward a broad exposure to a variety of occupational clusters."

The wards rotate through auto body and fender repair, auto tune-up, small engine repair, welding and landscape gardening for short but intensive periods—usually about 90 days in each shop.

"It's the exposure to a variety of things that will enhance a ward's chances of being placed in an entry-level job or advanced training when he gets out," Detling said.

For Flynn, however, the importance of exposing the ward to a variety of different shops serves two main functions while in school. It first gives him a chance to discover his abilities in each of the shops or "training modules."

Secondly, it provides the opportunity for him to transfer skills learned in one area to be applied in another.

"There is compatibility among shops," Flynn said. "If a ward can measure a metal frame, he certainly can measure a wooden one. We have the 90-day modules so he can see what he likes and doesn't like. If auto body and fender is not a guy's cup of tea, we try to move him on after the 90 days."

Flynn also noted the 90 days serve to settle the ward when he first comes to DeWitt Nelson and to move him honorably to something else if he cannot attain the entry-level standards of a particular skill.

The student's day is split in half, with vocational shops being one half and academic classes the other half. In the academic program students grapple with upgrading their reading, math and language skills both at a remedial and high school level. Thus, according to Administrator Detling, "the entire thrust of the education program, both vocational and educational, is to prepare students to successfully enter the job market upon release to parole."

But the training center is also realistic. If a ward discovers that what he's interested in is not offered at DeWitt or if he exhausts the academic and vocational program, then he can request training at the Woodruff Regional Occupational Center in Stockton. The primary purpose of the Woodruff Center is to provide each student with a salable skill, and there the DeWitt Nelson ward can take business, cosmetology, technical drafting, health sciences and truck driving, which are some of the course offerings. There are usually five to 10 wards at Woodruff.

"We ask the ward when he first comes to us what he would like to be or what he would like to do later on," said Ernie Cervantes, supervisor of academic instruction at DeWitt Nelson. "We attempt to set up goals with the kid, and sometimes we find he's interested in something we can't offer here. It's good to know you have an outlet like the Woodruff Center."

Another outlet is the work furlough program, aimed at providing practical work experience during the last 90-day module of a ward's institutional stay. Some 27 wards are generally involved in this program on a continuing basis.

"We try to match a guy's skills with something he can do during the 90-day period," said Perry Graves, who coordinates the work furlough program. "But it's not always possible to match skills a ward has learned with a particular job—you've got to remember Stockton has one of the highest unemployment rates in the state."

Nevertheless, Graves, who considers himself an employment counselor, manages to get jobs for the wards. They work in fast-food restaurants and in cement, welding, trucking and construction companies. Ninety-five percent of the wards during the 90-day period maintain their jobs.

Said Graves, "One of the hardest things to give a ward during this time is self-confidence."

One recently paroled ward, who worked in a fast-food restaurant, had no trouble expressing his self-confidence. "I learned a lot," he said, referring to both the school and the job. "I've also learned to control my temper—in the beginning I was very negative," he said. About the job the ward said, "You've got to earn your keep, and you've got to like the job." He also said he eventually wanted to get into printing.

Wards who work within the NCYC complex also feel good about themselves.

One ward who worked full-time collecting and delivering laundry to the three institutions, found that a job was the best way he could serve his time. Proud that

he had not missed a day's work in eight months, he said, "This job is the one thing that has done me a lot of good." He added, "The only thing that's going to hold me down on the streets is a steady job."

Vocational theorists and counselors admit the development of entry-level skills to obtain a job will not in itself insure security and success in the job market. For youthful offenders the development of social skills is perhaps the key factor in insuring this success, and DeWitt Nelson staff recognize this.

"We strive for continuity," said Supt. Glenn Avery. "Along with developing occupational skills, we're concerned with developing social skills. Can a kid keep from blowing up on the job, for example?"

Avery, who believes social skills are more important in some ways than occupational skills, said self-control and the ability to relate to peers are important aspects of the DeWitt Nelson school program. "As the kid moves through the different shops, his social skills are being tested constantly," he said.

According to Cervantes, the development of social skills is built into the system. "When we talk about entry-level skills," he said, "we're talking about social aspects of work, the attitudes toward those around him, his supervisors."

Dr. Mark Wiederanders, CYA researcher who completed a study of job survival among parolees, found that having appropriate attitudes, habits and interpersonal skills on the job are as important as the ability to do the specific task.

Wiederanders, who found that the average parolee lasted on the job about three months, suggests that job survival can be enhanced if there is career planning, along with vocational training while in an institution and community-based training or employment upon release to parole.

"Institutions are now beginning to provide some continuity in this process," he said.

Avery believes DeWitt Nelson is providing that continuity and more. "We hope to inculcate the work ethic," he said. "Most kids don't understand the meaning of work, that it is a means to an end. As you're teaching occupational and social skills, you're also helping the kid to develop a self-image—work is the means by which wards attain identity."

Donald Super, career development theorist, would agree with the notion of developing a self-image. Noted for his self-concept theory of vocational development, Super believes that the self-concept of an individual is a continually developing entity that shifts with the different experiences of life to reflect the demands of reality.

"The vocational self-concept develops in a similar way," he writes. "As an individual matures, he tests himself in many ways, most of which have implications for educational and vocational decisions."

The message to help a ward attain his self-concept is simple and clear at DeWitt, according to Avery. "You're a man," he said, "and we say this to him at every turn. Whether he's in school, on a work furlough, or on a kitchen crew, we expect a day's work."

Such clear expectations make the program at DeWitt Nelson both simple and diverse. In its simplicity the program's goals and expectations are very clear: everything is geared to vocational development. In its diversity, the program offers the ward many opportunities to test himself, to find where he best fits.

Avery believes that assessment is the key to the program's success. "If a kid is productive and useful and he feels he fits somewhere, we've done our job," he said. "That's what we hope we're doing here."

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Single copies of items listed without a price may be obtained from the issuing agency. Priced items may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Payment and item number must accompany all orders.

### OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Educational Programs That Work" 283 pp. Fifth edition of OE's catalog of projects developed in local school districts with the aid of federal funds. Focusing on many subject areas and grade levels, these educational alternatives vary in philosophy, cost, and complexity, but each one actually works. \$5 from Order Department, Far West Laboratory, 1855 Folsom St., San Francisco, CA 94103.

### NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

"Energy: Knowledge and Attitudes" 46 pp. Survey done in mid-1977 by the National Assessment of Educational Progress about what adults aged 26-35 know and don't know about energy issues. \$3.75 from NAEP, 1860 Lincoln St., Denver, CO 80295.

"Projections of Education Statistics to 1986-87" 172 pp. \$3.75. S/N 017-080-01918-3. Based on NCES data from 1966 to 1977 and on recent Census Bureau population estimates, this annual publication provides projections on sizes of enrollments, numbers of teachers, earned degrees, amounts of school expenditures and tuition charges at all levels. "The State of Teacher Education, 1977" 112 pp. Provides data on the condition of preservice teacher education and summarizes future planning activities. Sections on teacher supply and demand, fiscal issues in teacher preparation, professional standards, demographics on graduates; 40 charts; 13 tables. Free from Celeste Loar, Rm. 3055, NCES, Washington, D.C. 20202.

### OTHER AGENCIES

"Career Opportunities in the Trucking Industry" 80 pp. \$2.50. S/N 029-000-00306-8. Designed for educators, counselors, and placement officers, this report by the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration gives a history of trucking, explains types of carriers, and describes many occupations and worker traits associated with trucking; contains glossary of trucking terminology and bibliography of additional resources.

"Television, the Book and the Classroom" 128 pp. Proceedings of a two-day seminar held at the Library of Congress in April 1978, co-sponsored by the Library's Center for the Book and the U.S. Office of Education. Talks by leaders in TV, education, publishing, and government about ways of integrating TV and the printed word in the education process. \$4.95 from Library of Congress, Information Office, Washington, D.C. 20540.

"What's New on the Moon" 24 pp. \$0.70 S/N 033-000-00653-5. NASA's program chief of Extraterrestrial Materials tells what we have learned about the moon and what mysteries remain, suggests future plans, and lists further reading.



**RETURN ADDRESS**

**CALIFORNIA YOUTH AUTHORITY**  
4241 Williamsburgh Dr.  
Sacramento, California 95823

UNIVERSITY MICROFILM INC  
300 NORTH ZEEB ROAD  
ANN ARBOR MICHIGAN 48106



